HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 42 Saturday, October 20, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

The Last Stretch: In the past forty-eight hours, nervousness has been rising in both Democratic and Republican headquarters and it will increase in the next forty-eight and so on until the end of the campaign. For old pros like party chiefs Len Hall and Paul Butler are well aware that some unfortunate word or deed on the part of candidates or helpers can upset plans and swing the election.

A lingual blooper, a snub of an important politico, an unfortunate catch phrase uttered heedlessly (remember "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion") could alter a bloc of votes in what is regarded as a close election and dramatically change the outcome.

Republicans mentioning this know what they are talking about because they have just surmounted such a potential danger, thanks to the courage and alertness of Vice-Presidential candidate Dick Nixon.

The cause of the danger was the hotly controversial article in the current *Collier's* magazine by Paul Hoffman, rated as one of the liberal friends of the President, in which the author attacked the Republican right wing in general, focusing his strongest words on Senators Jenner of Indiana, McCarthy of Wisconsin, and Malone of Nevada, intimating that these three men should be read out of the party. As expected (probably as planned by the forces behind Hoffman), newspaper reporters queried President Eisenhower at a press conference on October 11. Versions differ as to whether the President did or did not intentionally imply that he would read these figures out of the party if it were not for the power of the local GOP parties in those states. Anyway, the liberal press managed to broadcast this impression.

Republican managers began to suffer acutely. Complete innocence of the Chief Executive in the matter, however, would not by itself prevent bad results from the incident. In 1916, GOP candidate Charles Evans Hughes, campaigning in California, was at one instance in the same hotel in Long Beach as Senator Hiram Johnson, powerful leader of the Bull Moose wing of the GOP. It would have been a wise act for the GOP Presidential candidate to call on Johnson. He did not do so. He did not know that Johnson was in the hotel. But Johnson knew that Hughes was in the same building and awaited a call. That he was disappointed when it did not happen is an understatement. The upshot was that Hughes failed to get the Bull Moose votes in that state, failed to win California and the election by a margin of 12 electoral votes. (Such an eyelash outcome could happen this year, it is generally agreed.)

Dick Nixon, who knows his California history, jumped into the breach opened by Paul Hoffman. On October 11, in Boulder, Colorado (*Washington Post and Times Herald*, October 12) Nixon was asked to comment on Ike's press conference reference to Jenner, McCarthy, and Malone, and replied that "there has to be room for a difference of opinion in a two-party system. I would disagree with those who say this person or that person should get out of the party." He explained that the President was doing a "splendid job in getting the Republican party behind his views on domestic and foreign policy" and thought it would be a mistake to encourage splinter parties by reading anyone out.

After Nixon had spoken, the Hoffman article affair subsided and a HUMAN EVENTS check on sentiment in Indiana, Wisconsin, and Nevada — the states concerned — revealed that the incident had produced no unfortunate results.

Ike's stock this week soared. Observers recall that it was high a month ago, slumped two weeks ago, now has recovered. One important cause of Adlai's decline is his stand on the H-bomb tests.

H-Bomb Dispute: In his speech last Monday, Adlai Stevenson said that "If every man, woman, and child on earth were each carrying a 16-pound bundle of dynamite — enough to blow him to smithereens and then some — the destructive force in their arms would be equal to the force of *one 20-megaton hydrogen bomb, which has already been exploded.*" A HUMAN EVENTS source familiar with America's program of nuclear armament maintains that Stevenson's "20-megaton" statement is a security break, revealing "Secret Restricted Data." When called upon for comment, the Atomic Energy Commission refused to say whether Stevenson's speech broke security or not.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adlai's Wealth: Adlai Stevenson, the New Deal critic of great wealth, is not merely (as many believe) a "well-off" man. He is in fact a multi-millionaire. Some of the facts have been published, as for instance in recent syndicated columns by Peter Edson, on Adlai's stock exchange "blue chips" holdings. But actually Stevenson has also large resources in land and in a newspaper in Illinois. HUMAN EVENTS, after some investigation, is now able to offer some significant information about the Adlai Stevenson fortune.

In 1952 Adlai had a nice portfolio of common stocks, many well known on the stock exchange. Their average price per share then was $37.21. If Adlai was not engaged in "campaign oratory" during his 1954 speech-making tour, if he really believed his own predictions that a serious depression was ahead, he would have sold his stocks and bought bonds with the proceeds. If he sold out in 1954, he missed the biggest portion of the rise that has taken place in his 1952 holdings. On last September 17, these stocks averaged $74.08 a share or about double their 1952 value. Columnist Edson, who compiled some of this stock data, suggested that on this basis Stevenson must be worth about a million dollars.

But that is not all. Adlai has an important interest in a prosperous newspaper property in Bloomington, Illinois, the *Daily Pantagraph*. He holds in it a 24½ per cent interest, according to information HUMAN EVENTS has obtained from newspaper appraisers as well as a high official on the *Pantagraph*. These sources claim that his share in this newspaper is alone worth "well in excess of a million dollars."

Finally, his real estate holdings are considerable — not the least of which is his palatial home in Chicago's Libertyville suburb, where a mere $100,000 home is considered a "dump." And then there is his farm near Bloomington, Illinois. The farm, 240 acres of land worth at least $75,000, is jointly owned with his sister, Mrs. Ernest Ives, and like most of Adlai's wealth was inherited from his grandfather. Taking all into account — home, farm, share in *Pantagraph* and blue chips on the Exchange — Adlai Stevenson is worth nearer two million than one. He is indeed the multimillionaire candidate.

States' Rights Party: The States' Rights "movement" — aimed to win some votes in the current election and to form the basis of a real national party in 1960 — got off the ground on October 15 in Richmond, Virginia, "nominating" T. Coleman Andrews (President) and Thomas H. Werdel (Vice President). The meeting drew 2,800 delegates and spectators; the regular Democrats held a rally the same day in Richmond (addressed by Senator Kennedy) which drew only 500.

Washington observers look across the Potomac at the political landscape of Virginia and wonder if boasts that the Andrews-Werdel ticket (on the ballot) can win are correct. They doubt it, but note that a newspaper poll in Richmond gives States' Rights 28 per cent, Ike 30 per cent, and Stevenson 29 per cent, with 13 per cent undecided. Still others look north to New Jersey where States' Rights is on the ballot, and New York, where it isn't. A write-in for the ticket is being discussed in New York City. It is believed that the States' Rights leaders' frank friendship for Senator McCarthy may provide publicity and write-in appeal. Even in the South, this party draws support from Ike rather than from Adlai.

Meanwhile, the leaders have little cause for complaint about press treatment in general — with wire services and special correspondents attending the birth at Richmond. The *Wall Street Journal* awarded the event one column and an editorial, both moderately, although cautiously, approving. But the biggest coup — of which States' Righters are very proud — was a long, headline editorial in the Communist *Daily Worker*, replete with all the epithets such as "reactionary" and "fascist." That indeed, they agree, was the true accolade.

Announcement: States' Rights TV program, CBS, Saturday, October 20, 5:30 PM, EDT; States' Rights radio program, CBS, Tuesday, October 23, 10:30 PM, EDT.

Labor Front: While the Eisenhower regime has had a better record on labor than the Democrats, from the viewpoint of conservatives, some concern is developing among a number of employers and firms on the specific question of "right-to-work" laws. This bulwark against compulsory unionism is currently tossed back and forth on the tides of a fierce battle waged by labor union officials throughout the country.

Now, it is common talk on Capitol Hill that the AFL-CIO will mount a big drive after the first of the year to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, specifically to repeal section 14-B, with no little chance of success, particularly if the Democrats again control Congress. This section is the one which permits states to pass laws banning compulsory unionism. Should this happen, one of the greatest barriers to trade union hegemony would be removed.

Concern among employers grows as it is realized that the GOP Administration's own Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, has been an outspoken opponent of "right-to-work" legislation. The Under Secretary of Labor, Arthur C. Larson, recently (see HUMAN EVENTS issue of September 1), put himself on record as supporting compulsory unionism; and a few days later Larson was endorsed by Presi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent Eisenhower himself. Finally, it is recalled that Mitchell, soon after he took office in 1953, remarked that he himself was for elimination of Section 14-B, although he backtracked later when challenged on this issue.

All in all, employers now enjoy no surety that the Eisenhower Administration will not surrender this great bastion against labor dictatorship. Therefore, many would like to hear a frank "yes" or "no" promise on this matter from the Administration in the course of the presentation of its case for re-election before the American people.

Aid To Tito: Great astonishment is expressed along Washington's diplomatic row at President Eisenhower's decision, announced this week, to continue to send economic aid to Yugoslavia. Foreign attachés here can see no valid reason for such a move today.

In 1948, they point out, a special situation justified President Truman's decision to help arm Yugoslavia. At that time, the Red satellite governments of Romania and Bulgaria were massing troops along the Yugoslav border and Tito's army was ill-supplied with modern arms. The Western powers were afraid that these Red puppet armies would move to the Adriatic, thereby threatening Italy. Hence, there was a sound reason for the start of the process of giving American aid to Yugoslavia.

Today no such power situation exists. Ike's decision not to send heavy arms is commendable, but diplomats perceive little basis for hope that any economic assistance will affect Tito's pro-Moscow attitude. The Red dictator is regarded as a prominent member of what they are coming to term the Moscow-Peiping-Belgrade-Cairo Axis, which is working to undermine Western security.

Experts on Capitol Hill — in agreement with the above comments — say the decision for economic aid to Yugoslavia was a triumph for the Stassen-Milton Eisenhower group among Presidential advisers. Foreign aid to these is a fetish. Before the decision was made — we are able to disclose — Vice President Nixon, Senators Knowland and Bridges were consulted and strongly urged that further aid of any kind be withheld. The outcome, ironically, is looked upon here as the "comeback of Stassen" to major activity, less than two months after his humiliation at the GOP convention in San Francisco. Realization of this casts a chill on Republicans whose assistance is sought in the election campaign.

Not Merely Election Gossip: One of the puzzling phenomena of the Republican election campaign has been the virtual silence — in the state of Ohio — of Senator John Bricker, author of the treaty law amendment, and one of the most powerful vote-getters in Ohio history. He makes no speeches, or — to any important extent — public appearances. Around the press rooms in Washington, it is said that he — like Senator Barry Goldwater, whose critical attitude toward labor bossism has earned him the enmity of the White House liberals — just isn't being asked by the Republican high command to make any speeches during this campaign.

● After Dave Beck, head of the Teamsters Union, called on the President in the White House, and then announced his support of the Eisenhower ticket, much speculation arose in the Capital as to just what Dave got out of all this for himself. Nothing — is the answer by those in the know. However, exactly what Beck and his union crowd are trying to get out of it all, according to reliable sources, is, namely: to persuade the Administration to get its Small Business Administration to grant financial assistance to various trucking concerns with whom Beck's union has advantageous contracts. The argument which Beck's lobbyists put up to the SBA is that these firms should receive Government financial aid because they are having difficulty in competing with the railroads. So far there's no indication that SBA is listening.

● Throwing dust in the eyes of the public — such is the tactic utilized by the Communists to deal with the New York Senatorial contest between New York Attorney General Javits, the Republican candidate, and Mayor Wagner, the Democrat. Through the *Daily Worker*, the comrades have given the impression that they are backing Wagner. But American intelligence agents say they *know* that the Party has given orders to members and fellow-travellers to *vote for* Javits.

Utah: J. Bracken Lee, Utah's courageous Governor, announces he will seek a third term in spite of last month's primary defeat of his bid for re-nomination as a Republican.

Political dopesters in Utah ascribe his primary defeat to intervention of out-of-state liberal-internationalist elements and the machinations of the state's senior Senator, Republican Arthur V. Watkins, who maneuvered covertly to have many Democrats vote in the GOP primary — against Lee.

Lee, yielding to importunings of friends who already had filed petitions to have his name printed on the ballot as an independent, bluntly declared that one of his major reasons for running again without his party's designation is to prevent Watkins from establishing himself as Republican boss of the state.

Utah pundits rate Lee a long-shot, but one not to be written off too lightly. They point out that he has proven his popularity in the state by his two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

previous gubernatorial victories, and that with his name printed on the ballot, his campaign cannot be compared to a write-in effort.

Whether he wins or loses, however, the consensus is that his entry into the race effectively kills the chances of Watkins' hand-picked GOP nominee, Utah Water and Power Board Chairman George D. Clyde. There also is some Republican fear that the bitterness engendered by the Lee-Watkins fight may spill over and result in defeat of GOP Senator Wallace Bennett's bid for re-election.

Lee won the enmity of liberals and internationalists, for whom Watkins is generally regarded as a willing spokesman, by his outspoken opposition to profligate Government spending, foreign giveaways and growing concentration of governmental power in Washington. He has refused to pay his Federal income taxes in an effort to challenge the constitutionality of foreign aid programs.

Junkets: John S. Coleman, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, proposes a solution to the question of free steamship trips to the Panama Canal for Members of Congress — and cut-rate journeys for their families and aides — so logical and so simple that it completely escapes notice in the public prints.

Mr. Coleman notes that the Panama Canal Company steamship line plying between New York and the Canal Zone, via West Indies ports, is "one of the most flagrant examples of Government competition with private business," and says:

"The real issue is not the possible abuse of this [free junket] privilege, but why the Government should be operating this steamship line in direct competition with privately-owned American-flag services. . . .

"Existing private [tax-paying] carriers in this trade are able, willing and anxious to provide the service now offered by the Government line. The Panama Canal Company, therefore, should be discontinued forthwith as a Government operation and bids advertised for its sale."

Book Review: *Farmers at the Crossroads,* by Ezra Taft Benson (as told to Carlisle Bargeron). The Devin-Adair Company, 23 East 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y., Price $2.50. (Commentary by Dean Harry J. Reed of the College of Agriculture, Purdue University, Indiana.)

Three times in 35 years, war and inflation have brought farmers high prices. The deflation that followed brought low prices and reduced incomes. Over the past two decades, I've seen the Federal Government take an ever-increasing hand in the farming business. And some unwise legislation passed during emergencies has created more problems than it has cured.

The Secretary of Agriculture today, rightly or wrongly, has tremendous power and authority — granted by Congress — over the activities of farm operators. More, I'm afraid, than any Secretary of Agriculture should have, if we prize our freedom. The Secretary, however, does not make the laws, he administers them.

Ezra Taft Benson knows farm problems, for he was a farmer, a county agricultural agent, and for several years executive secretary of one of the major national farm organizations.

He believes that individual farmers know more about running their own farms than Washington bureaucrats can possibly know. He believes that research and education will contribute to the sound solution of the problems of agriculture.

He has resisted unsound measures that might be politically popular — measures that would really hurt farmers in the long run instead of helping them.

Ezra Taft Benson's proposals, as outlined in this book, can do much to protect the rights and improve the status of the farm family, and in general give agriculture sound direction during the most critical period any Secretary of Agriculture has been asked to serve.

Letter from WILLIAM H. PETERSON, Associate Professor of Economics, Graduate School of Business, New York University: "In my contacts with students, I find a keen appreciation of HUMAN EVENTS. They read it with genuine eagerness because it reveals political and economic activities often untold in the publications they ordinarily read."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

Bound Volumes for 1956 — indexed — may now be ordered for March delivery. Regular price, $15; pre-publication price, accepted until December 31, $7.50 each.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIII, No. 42 HUMAN EVENTS October 20, 1956

Article Section

IT SEEMS TO ME:
The Strategy of the Election Campaign

By FREDERIC NELSON

IN THE best speech by anybody delivered at the San Francisco Cow Palace last August, Herbert Hoover suggested to the Republican delegates that it would be a good idea if, "instead of your traditional platform, you should make a resounding declaration of the principles of American life, and perhaps separately prepare a short summary of your views on less vital issues."

Of course, nobody paid any attention to the advice of the former President, and the Republican platform came out about as most such documents do: a clumsy hodgepodge of unrelated paragraphs, designed to make the pressure groups think they are getting what they are supposed to want, without actually making firm commitments on anything.

The platform covered a bewildering array of subjects, but at a time when "the greatest issue in America and all mankind is the encroachments of government to master our lives," as Mr. Hoover put it, it was possible for John O'Donnell to write in the New York *Daily News* that "not in an entire political generation . . . has an American political campaign developed so few basic controversial issues." Until the campaign took a turn toward reality in its recent stages, this was almost literally true.

Nobody is really worked up about anything. To read the party platforms and listen to most of the speeches one might assume that the average American had no deeper interest in his country than its ability to set up a four-day week for him or guarantee that his income would be as generous in his declining years as it had been at the peak of his earning power and productive ability. One would never suspect that anybody anywhere was alarmed about the extravagances of foreign aid, supported by inordinate demands upon the income and property of every citizen. In the corner pub or supermarket you can hear people grousing about a lot of things from high prices to Secretary Dulles' efforts to cool off the Suez crisis.

But the party leaders give this kind of grumbling no more time than they give to complaints from their own rank and file about the growth of government power or "the drift to socialism." The Democratic platform makers were so eager to carry the ball for the Americans for Democratic Action, and the Republicans so anxious not to offend these custom-tailored socialists, that both platforms managed to omit most of the questions which are troubling people today.

THE WORST of it is, this avoidance of "controversial" issues looks deliberate. It hooks up with the "leashing" of Nixon and the wishful but unrealistic idea that Communism isn't an issue any more. Now that the Communists have announced to all who will listen that they intend to crawl into bed with Democrats, labor unions, socialists and even with receptive Republicans, this attempt to keep

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communism out of the campaign may be subject to judicious review. Indeed it begins to look as if something of the sort were already taking place. The GOP could come to agree with agonized Councilman Stanley M. Isaacs of New York, who resigned from the ADA because it refused to endorse Jake Javits for the Senate. Mr. Isaacs' statement, which must be a new high in belated wisdom for an individual over 21, was: "There's no room for a Republican in the ADA!" This triumph of experience over hope deserves concentrated attention at the national level.

By now it must have occurred to "the men around Eisenhower" that they are unlikely to win the confidence or even the votes of basic Republicans by representing their party, at any rate by innuendo and implication, as a group of dated and reactionary fatheads, "isolationist" if not actually corrupt, which could be a pretty fair party once it was made over by President Eisenhower. It is all very well to tempt "independent voters" with dreams of socialistic avarice and a "new America," but elections can't be won without the sharp-faced or broad-bottomed boys in the precincts, who study the voting lists and see to it that the hired Cadillacs pick up the right people and get them to Public School 687 or the barber shop voting place before the polls close. President Eisenhower's experience must surely have taught him that, no matter how sound the work of the "war plans division," it is tough winning battles without the cooperation of the sergeants and second lieutenants.

THE TOP BRASS is now warning us all against "apathy," as if apathy were a disease that could be counteracted by some sort of mass inoculation via radio and TV. But if apathy exists, it is because the people aren't steamed up about anything — at any rate about anything favorable to the side which complains about apathy. Of course, as Maine showed, a lot of Democrats were steamed up, while too few Republicans were.

I wouldn't undertake to say why, except to observe that it might be because the Republicans in Maine, like the Cow Palace platform makers, chose to ignore the things that people are really steamed up about. When textile manufacturers tell you that the State Department now seems as indifferent to their efforts to protect themselves from foreign competition as it was in the Acheson era, you can understand why one group of Republicans wasn't out there ringing doorbells. The leadership seems to have stuck to President Eisenhower's undoubted popularity as the key issue, forgetting that the distinguishing feature of the Eisenhower military jacket was that it had no coat tails!

Many people, not only in Maine but all over, are steamed up about the possibility that socialistic laws could be put over on us through the treaty-making process. But instead of either endorsing the Bricker amendment, designed to make this impossible, or ignoring it altogether, the Republican platform went out of its way to steam up a lot of people against the Administration by stating that "we maintain that no treaty or international agreement can deprive any of our citizens of constitutional rights. We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries attempts to deprive our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution." No mention, of course, of the "Status of Forces" agreements with countries where American troops are stationed — agreements which already deprive Americans unfortunate enough to be called on to defend their country of very important rights!

The Bricker Amendment appeals to millions of people as a proper constitutional way to settle a question which is clouded with vagueness and contradictions. If the GOP is sincere in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"seeing to it" that abuses of the treaty power which the platform says cannot happen shall not occur in the future, its leaders might have made this intention clear by plugging for the Bricker Amendment. Instead they annoyed believers in the Bricker Amendment without satisfying the "internationalists" who are against it.

There are live issues enough, many of them pretty desperate ones, and some of them capable of being stepped up, or watered down, to television appeal, once the party managers stop relying on "Eisenhower's great popularity" (GOP), or the "disappointment among the uncommitted independents" (Dem.) — neither of which raises anybody's blood pressure.

During the Democratic convention, Governor Frank Lausche of Ohio remarked to a pair of morbid curiosity seekers, "Doesn't it strike you as extraordinary that in this great convention — and I dare say the same thing will be true of the Republicans — not a voice has been raised to express concern over our vast Federal debt?" As an off-horse member of a convention run by a group which thinks debt is good for the country, Governor Lausche did not take to the floor and let them have it. Perhaps it would have done no good if he had.

After all, the Republicans of Utah beat Governor J. Bracken Lee for worrying out loud and in public about debt. The scuttlebutt is that the schoolteachers of Utah, a group which has as much to fear from inflation and a thirty-cent dollar as any other section of the population, moved into the Republican primary just to knock off Governor Lee. He opposed Federal aid to schools and with the education bloc that is treason. Sometimes the theory that people vote in accordance with their self-interest seems a little hard to prove.

But some of the responsibility for these reverses must be borne by the GOP as a whole for failing to point up the issue that Federal pap isn't for free. The White House Conference on Education was the spot to plant a few sound apostles of common sense. Instead the meeting played the White House as a front for Federal control of education — unfairly, of course, but effectively.

Even so, a considerable fuss could have been got going about the national debt, with overtones of the "welfare state" and whether or not it can meet its promissory notes in real or wooden money. After all, even the wage earner, white or blue-collar, might be roused enough to wonder what becomes of that $28.60 deducted from his pay envelope every week. Up to now the workers seem to think the boss has been taking it to pay for white-walled tires and his sons' school bills at St. Swithens. However, with both parties committed, although in different degrees of enthusiasm, to the blessings of the welfare state, nobody is likely to put in a word for economy without having his fingers crossed.

In his most recent speeches, President Eisenhower gives signs of wearying of the non-partisan-type campaign dictated by his "high level" associates. These are the men who, as Clarence Buddington Kelland wrote in *U.S. News and World Report* two years ago, "do not recognize that partisan politics — Democratic defeat by Republicans — elevated them, and that ordinary common sense requires that they should recognize their obligations to party." If Robert J. Donovan's book, *Eisenhower: the Inside Story,* pictured correctly the attitude of the White House strategists, the Ike entourage was led to think of itself as owing nothing to Republican organizations in 1952 and everything to "independents," who seem not to have heard that Stevenson was running. The Eisenhower mood then, as reported by Mr. Donovan, was definitely against the Old Guard, even to the point of some vague talk about forming a new party.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course, this "high level" nonsense couldn't last. Somebody had to throw a brick. Nixon was the expected victim, and it was a surprise to all when Stevenson let fly his stupid and unchecked charge that Dr. Milton Eisenhower was somehow responsible for lending Argentina's Dictator Peron enough American money to enable him to take it on the lam. The response (that the loan to Peron was made by the Democratic Administration while Milton Eisenhower was still at Penn State) made a monkey out of Stevenson, but, more important, it made a partisan of Eisenhower.

Ike can now bring himself to describe even Senator Dirksen, that once irreconcilable "Taftite," as "my good friend," although it may be that the Senator has also made sacrifices in the interest of harmony. He also mentions the Republican party as if it were something worth belonging to. As the Democrats begin throwing their punches closer and closer to the belt line, it has doubtless dawned on the Republicans — even on the Palace Guard — that Mr. Isaacs of New York was right: "there is no room for a Republican in the ADA." After all, there is solid experience behind this conclusion. Despite Republican hints that maybe the Taft-Hartley law might be "liberalized" so as to get rid of state "right-to-work" laws, the AFL-CIO monopoly ungratefully endorsed Stevenson. As the French say, *"Mais oui!"*

Most people are practical enough to understand that a hard-pressed statesman may be compelled at times to rise above principle, but a smart politician doesn't do it without seeing, or thinking he sees, some profit from the ignominious transaction. At any rate, it isn't either cricket or good judgment to drop the bird in the hand when the two birds in the bush show no sign of interest in the eager man with the net. After all, with the Democrats out and out for repeal of Taft-Hartley, for ending the "national origins" method of limiting immigration, for bigger and better foreign aid, with a "multilateral approach" — meaning that the countries which get it also dish it out — there is no reason for a left-liberal to vote for the most progressive or dynamic Republican on earth.

THE ELECTION hasn't happened yet, but the way the wind has been blowing here and there, it is a pretty good bet that Republican candidates who look like Republicans, with no New Deal renovation, will fare better than their more nervous contemporaries. As to the "independents," the late Senator Taft put it something like this: "Of course we want to attract independents! If we have a program based on sound principles that appeals to them, the independents will vote Republican. But, if we try to get their votes by giving up our principles and adopting the other fellow's, we might win an election, but where would we be as a party?" And where, it might be added, would we be as a politically literate country?

If things look black for the GOP on the morning after election night, there will be at least a few Republicans who will be asking themselves if it wasn't a bad idea to write Bob Taft off as a "zombi."

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Frederic Nelson has been Associate Editor of *The Saturday Evening Post*, in charge of the editorial page, since 1942. Previously, he had been editorial writer for the Baltimore *Sun* from 1929 to 1942. He won the Freedoms Foundation Award, for an editorial, in 1951. His last article appeared in HUMAN EVENTS on August 4 — "Investigations Then and Now — How the GOP Split in 1910."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED